THE MEANING OF 'TWO':

(Semantic notes on the numeral 'two' and two-ness)

Kiyoshi OHBA

FOREWORD:

The onset of learning a foreign language is usually to get familiar with its grammar, vocabulary, and the world in which it is spoken and written. And the learner's knowledge will advance at the same time in parallel with a gradually unfolding increase in informative and cultural aspects. And then in the course of time one is not infrequently surprised at the similarity between his mother tongue and the language under study. Especially note-worthy is the similarity existing in the mental and psychological working rather than the syntactical aspect, even if the morphemes might be completely alien to his vernacular. He will come to understand that a heart is a heart wherever and whenever. This plasant surprise in learning a foreign language leads, in the case of the present writer, to the interest in number system in the English language and languages at large.

As a matter of fact, number systems in languages are too often ignored or neglected even among specialists as well as among lay circle. It seems that both of them regard the subject as dry-as-dust, and as bloodless and boring. I believe, however, that it is high time we should reconsider the role played by number systems in language, especially in the perspective of formative period of language. Nobody can deny that a great deal is in common among languages all over and all across time, and number system is among semantic common denominators.

In this connection, Ralph Linton says:

> 'The title of the book (= The Tree of Culture) refers, not to the familiar evolutionary tree with a single trunk and spreading branches, but to the banyan tree of the tropics. The branches of the banyan tree cross and send down adventitious, aerial roots which turn into supporting trunks. Although the banyan tree spreads and grows until it becomes a miniture jungle, it remains a single plant and its various branches are traceable to the parent trunk.'

Here, however, this is not the place to discuss whether the origin of man was polygenestic or monogenestic. (Cf. M. Boulton: The Anatomy of Language)

As for number system in general, it is agreed that the buildup of conceptual framework was taking shape around the early Bronze Age (after c. 3,500 B.C.), with was perhaps stimulated by the beginning of urban life. It was for previous to Copernicus's De Revolutionibus (1534) and to Newton (1642 - 1727). For the sake of a better historical perspective, here is the following division of history.

Old Stone Age began about	500,000 years ago.
New stone Age began about	6,000 B.C.
Historic period began about	4,000B.C.

As this paper is going to check up the semantic functions of the basic numerals in current use --- mainly 'one' and 'two' --- in the English language, our efforts to reach toward the bottom of the issue may seem as if trying to make the impossible possible. But in this connection, R.W.L. Smith says (Dictionary of English Word-roots, Introduction) 'there are no long words in the English language', by which he means that so-called long words are only 'a succession of shorter pieces, each of which has a simple meaning'. So, it is roots and etymons of simple words that matter. We cannot make do with poor etymological dictionaries.

But on the face of it, not only awful distance in time and space fron today but also sparse positive evidences and a variety of 'missing links' --- these two factors seem to combine to bring out a lot of difficulties in our way. On the other hand, thanks to scientific progresses such as Argon-40 and C-14 tests and to the impetus of lateral sciences, I think a promising field widely is open before us. What we were in the dark about before is now becoming clear. It may not impossible for us to find some clues to the identity of human mind and heart, to the 'presumably universal psychological processes in which all mankind shared'. (Ethnopsychology, D. R. Price-Williams, Introduction to Cultural Anthropology)

The writer's universalistic standpoint is based on the belief that our psychological working has remained, so to speak, as primitive, uncultured, and un-refined as ever, greatly improportionate to the progresses of modern civilization. There is one thing to remember that a clear line must be drawn between the system of numerical idea and the system of numerals.

OVERVIEW OF HISTORICAL AND ANTHROPOLOGICAL BACKGROUND:

First of all, we need a sketchy historical picture of the world in which the primates were living, as 'historical charts are to history what maps are to

geography'. Our topic is, as mentioned above, concerned not with the geological periods but with the period within and around the pre-history. The relative length can be shown with some accuracy in the scale below:

The whole length of man's life on earth:

The Paleolithic (Old Stone Age) Period	Through the historic ages Down to the present
99% : 1%	

What happened on earth and to early man? Let us here list up only factual data which are of use, more or less, to our study.

(1) The Paleolithic period of Man's development is roughly contemporary with most of the Pleistocene period of the earth's history. (W. Langer)

(2) The remains of Pleistocene men so far discovered total about 230 individuals. (W. Langer)

(3) They can be classified into 'two successive species'. Homo erectus and Homo sapiens.

With only this much of a rough and broad understanding of the primates, we will delve into the numerical concept framework in the cradle.

Although there are several ways to classify the early man, such as Mongoloids, Australoids, Cancasoids, Capoids, and Congoids, we may take them as a united whole, as far as the formative period of language is concerned. It is because a great deal of homogenity in physiognomy and pscychology can be found all among them. Their existing minor differences are due to the variety of living conditions and environments; some of man-features outran some others, while some lagged or fell behind in evolution. In a word, their evolution was not a harmonions and balanced one in every feature; it was promoted, coupled with the devolutions such as weakning of jaws and coccyx and canine teeth and losing of fangs and cuspids.

The most important feature was upright walking, first, last, and all the time. The ability of upright walking, very small as it was at the beginning, did serve to accelerate the establishment of superior position of man as homo erectus among the other primates: a small difference that has made a great difference since. It must have afforded him an indefatigable power in finding food, fighting enemies, and commanding better view for the survival on the earth. As is easily imagined, to

have his two hands free was to make a better use of stone tools, to set on inventing new tools, when coming down from the trees or sheltering in caves. It is certain that the flourishing of today's culture and civilization, especially outstanding space science, was in embryo largely around this period.

Such being the case, the topic of numerical notion among early men is the more challenging to us, linguistically and anthropologically.

Now, to turn to the main topic in this paper --- number concept in the proto-language. First of all we must be on guard against a fallible misunderstanding about the eoglottic stage. The old number system, to be more specific, the ancient system of numeration, being doubtful if it is worth the name, had very little to do with the one in modern arithmetic sense. It is needless to say that number concepts were formulated long, long before any systematic education come to be prevalent in the historical period. In the Mesolithic and Neolithic Age the existence of any systemtic thought is of little probability. It is only in the Bronze Ago that we can find a foreshadow of formulation of mathematics. It was about and aroung 2,500 to 3,000 years ago, an ignorable short time in comparison in geological time scale. It is far less than one-hundredth of a pin point. The orderly notion of number such as we have now --- zero, one, two, three --- should be eliminated in the first place from our consideration. (Cf. R. Linton, The Tree of Culture, p. 308). It is reported that the Bushmen in South Africa know only 'two', and 'more than two' is equal to 'many' in their understanding.

With regard to primitive vocabulary proper, Morris Swadesh, who I think is the only authoritative scholar paying due attention to number, numerals, and numeration in the light of linguistics, says: (The Origin and Diversification of Language, P. 183)

> "... We may suppose were dealing with a time span in which Vocabulary developed from a few hundred to a thousand or so elements and in which composite lexemes began to be improtant ... there is reason to believe that man's first precise counting went only from one to two."

And he gives a 100 basic word list (See Appendix No. 3). It is noteworthy that 'one' and 'two' are included in his list and 'three' and 'zero' are excluded, the last of which being much later discovery. ('zero' < Arab. = empty)

M. Moncalm gives the quotation from Max Müller's Science of Thought, p. 404, which tentatively lists up the 121 original concepts. (See Appendix No. 2) The well-known 850 words in 'The Basic English' have something suggestive in this

connection. And the German translations of the 'Basic words' employs about 2,600 words in my counting. This is because some English words requires two German words. For instance, 'act' = Tat: Handlung, and 'against' = gegen: an, and so forth. These three studies mentioned above are concerned with the size of vocabulary, basing on analytical speculations on the vocabulary hierarchy of the hypothetic proto-language. On this problem, I think, there is, and will be, nobody who can say the last word.

As for the dual, Vendryes says: (Language, English translation, p. 97) (Cf. Kennedy, Current English p. 426 ff.)

> "There are languages which once possessed, or still possess, a dual number. Indo-European had this dual, which was maintained in historic times for a shorter or longer period according to the language concerned, and gradually disappeared from almost all of them."

In my eye, however, it is more proper to say 'gradually disappeared in terms of morpheme and the dual notion itself has been fused into other words; the words like 'two-some', 'both', 'pair', and 'couple' have replaced the original function of the dual.

The whole points stated in the foregoing pages will be summarized by the quotation from H.G. Wells, who gives us a concise and clear idea about the primordial mentality of number. (The Outline of History, p. 97 ff.)

> "And Neolithic man was counting, and falling under the spell of numbers. There are savage languages that have no word for any number above five. Some peoples cannot go above two. But Neolithic man in the lands of his origin in Asia and Africa even more than in Europe was already counting his accumulating possessions. He was beginning to use tallies, and wondering at the triangularity of three and the squareness of four, and why some quantities like twelve were easy to divide in all sorts of ways, and others, like thirteen, impossible.

PARTICULARS:

(I) 'ONE' and 'ONE-NESS':

We start first with 'one'. But it is not that it should be treated in modern mathematical order of number system, but only for convenience' sake.

The basic form *oino-, Germanic *ainaz-, has an echo in Gk. oinos, L. unus, G. ein, Fr. un, OE an, the last of which was, in E.Partridge's words, 'thinned into' a. And Jespersen names it an indefinte classifying article. But it is a sure thing that there was no grammar in eoglottal stages of language. Then what was *oino- to hominid? My answer to this question is as follows:

The /a/ and its allophones are most natural and spontaneous speech sounds uttered involuntarily at the perception of a fact or a thing. Those Paleolithic hunters and food gathers cannot have been silent when something or someidea turns up in sight or in mind. Besides it may safely assumed that they had sharper acounstic and visual senses than we do today. In a word, the/a/ and its allophones were a sign of perception. But vowels are continuants, and still they can not last too long: After continuing as long as one breath at the longest, they must stop. The mouth, being shut, breath goes through the nasal cavity, producing the nasal sounds /m/ or /n/. The nasals, in their turn, can be continuants and are very sticky and lubricatory in nature. At the same time they serve to make articulation easier, which is a wonderful thing in vocal communicaion. So, the /a/ was thickened into an (one) at the early Bronze Age, when numerical notion was needed in the primitive life because of 'urban revolution'.

Without definite and positive evidences, the above interpretation may sound too reckless and non-scientific. It may sound an imaginary story which my imagination invented, I am afraid.

Now, putting aside one's subjective fancy, let us take a glance at the idioms with the numeral 'one' (Appendix No. 4), in the hope that they will show the semantic features in current English.

With regard to the semantic differentiation of 'one-ness', it must be kept in mind that the /a/ was originally something which might be labelled as 'demi-semi-sememe' --- almost unconscious utterence with little or no meaning. The original indication of the /a/ is replaced by 'any' in terms of indefinity, while the /wun/ is undertaking for definity and unity. A variety of semantic differentiation process of 'one-ness' can be shown in the following table.

(1) From vague perception sign to indefinity: Ex. one of these days; one of those things; one among thousands etc.

(2) From indefinity to singularity: Ex. loneliness; to be all one with, etc.

(3) To definity by the help of environmental context: Ex. one for the road; to be one up, etc.

The usage of those coming under the (3) group is especially remarkable in colloquialism, in which most of the referents are understood by the contexts, environmental or non-literary. The Random House Dictionary gives 19 idioms comprising 'one'.

As for the phrase I for one, Jespersen says that it probably originates from the old nursery rhyme: (MEG Pt. VII, p. 584)

> X shall stand for playmates ten;
> V for five stout stalwart men;
> I for one, as I'm alive
> C for a hundred, and D for five;
> M for a thousand soldiers true,
> and all these figures I've told you

And he considers:

> 'From this by a kind of popular pun the phrase has become established to denote the pronoun of the first person, and later it has been transferred to use in connexion with other personal names.'

If he had paid a little more attention to the idiom pattern like 'for one thing', he would have omitted the above explanation. (Cf. Makkai. Idiom Structure in English. p. 50)

uni-: mono-:

In considering compounding elements in the English language, we think of prefixes and suffixes, to which Kennedy (Current English P. 346) adds the third group 'free compounding elements'. They differ from the other two in that they can be used in any part of a word. The term 'affix' may be proper to this group. All of these, amounting more than two hundreds in all, are of Latin or Greek origin, having independent distinct meaning in themselves, 'largely the stock in trade of scholars and scientists'. (ibid.) The use of hyphen can make distinction among them, e.g. Pre-; -gram-. Practically 'mono-' is more active than 'uni-', but cannot be equal to 'one' in the point of connotation.

(II) 'TWO' and 'TWO-NESS':

Now we come to the last but not the least topic in this paper: —— the word 'two' and the notion, two-ness. For those who have any interest in language it is not difficult to sense a certain relationship between the etymon *dwo- and its variants *duva, *twai- (Germanic from), bi-, bis- (Latin form), di-, dis-. And with a little closer inspection I think we cannot end up the listing-up without de-, inter-, and intra-. Usually ordinary dictionaries in current use reckon without those three prefixes mentioned last in connexion with 'two-ness'. Some related words come up in our

mind at once. For example:

DIPLOMA: DEUCE: DOZEN: DUAL: DUET: DOUBLE: DUPLICATE: DOUBT: TWO: TWAIN: TWELVE: TWICE: TWIST: TWENTY: TWINE: BETWEEN: TWIN: TWILL: TWIG: BALANCE: BICYCLE: BISCUIT: COMBINATION: BINAL.

I want to add the following to the above group: demi-and semi-.

DECADENCE: DECAY: DECEASE: DECEIVE: DECEIVE: DECIDE: DEDUCE: DEFECT: DEFER: DEFORM: DERIBERATE: DEMONSTRATE" DERIVE: DESPISE: DETAIL DETAIN: DEVASTATE: DEVOUR: and the words with dis- (negative prefix).

There may be need to give a few words about the process of semantic differentiation or transfer, as current dictionaries are negligent about it. My understanding is:

(1) Two-ness means 'not one'.

(2) 'Not one' means 'apart, asunder'.

(3) 'Apart, asunder' means 'different'.

(4) 'Different leads to 'not the same'.

(5) 'Not the same' leads to 'no' ultimately.

To be brief, the process is from the numerative notion through the spatial to the negative.

To be more concrete, in the two groups below the numeral force is lurking, not on the surface in the first group. But in the second group the negative force is on top, although typographically there is very little which suggests the numerative notion.

(1) DIFFER: DIFFERENT: DOUBT, &.

(2) DIFFICULT: DISHONEST, &.

The first group reminds us of the idiomatic expressions like 'to be in two minds' and 'to think twice', while the second group hints the idiom 'Far from it! (= not at all)'. Again, to sum up a variety of semantic differentiation of 'two-ness', the process will be as follows:

(1) 'Two-ness' leads to 'duplicty'. ···doubt, double

(2) 'Duplicity' leads to 'separation'. ···side by side, apart, asunder, by

(3) 'Separation' leads to 'minus notion' or negation. ···down from, not one

It must be stated here that minus-notion is very closely related to negation and that

the very semantic fertility of 'two-ness' was so great that it fused itself into words in the formative period of language. It must have found its expression in de-, di-, du-, do- do-, bi-, bis-, twi-, dis-, ba-, be- (Cf. 'vice' : 'become' : 'belong' : 'balance' and 'belong'. See Klein), all of which were originally independent semantemes standing on their own.

We may add that the importance of the basic in language has given a big rise in kinesic studies recently, which aim at finding the universals in anthroporogical viewpoint. Even today about 70% of our daily communication is reported to be carried out through gesticulation. The subject has something in common with the basic notion of number, a full treatment of which will require volumes of a book.

Getting back to our proper subject 'two-ness' it must be added further that the way in which proto-semanteme stems off or branches off is from the concrete to the abstract, from denotation to connotation, and its referent expands into a field of metaphorization, sometimes at the expense of definity and clarity. This transfer process is evident at a glance of the number idioms in current use, where envionmental context helps a great deal. To give a few examples:

One for the road! She is a one for music.

one-man policy

Coffee'n Donuts, Tasty Twosome!

He fell between two stools.

He is quite above such petty, two-by-four matters.

He will regard this one as a twice-told tale.

CLOSING WORDS:

Enjoying the privilege of upright-walking, early man could obviously make the greatest use possible in outdoing the other animals. One of the greatest of all would have been to have his two hands free for the use of stone tools and weapons. It was this little difference that mattered to him which grew into immeasureable superiority in the long, long passage of time, mingled with evolution and devolution. It was a sort of what may be called privilege in embryo which enabled him to have time enough to sort out a variety of perceptions into conceptions. The gradual development of this faculty did surely accelerate the establishment of the other features of modern man anatomically and ecologically. The upright posture necessitated concurrently the changes in the way of living,

facilitated the use of stone tools, His period is well named the Neolithic period.

How heart-warming it is to imagine the pre-historic people counting their possessions by the use of pebbles, hands, feet, and fingers in a small group society numbering from 50 to 200 people at most. Going through the Neolithic Revolution and Urban Revolution they have grown into great man of the historic ages at last.

Lastly it must be stated that this paper was originally a collection of gleanings in my reading. And I am very much obliged to the editing staff that the manuscript was given the opportunity to be printed in black and white.

Basides it was to my great regret that the examples quoted are mostly collected from the dictionaries at hand, partly conditioned by time and spece limit, so that it was impossible to distinguish those in current use from the obsolete or obsolecent, the formal from the informal, or to tell which one predates the other. And still even now the interest in number notion is not behind me. A new tantalizing field is open before me, alluring an inquiry into inter- and intra-influences on affective language.

So, this is nothing but an interim report of my study on human mind, with which all the other papers of mine were following in line. We are always interested in ourselves, covertly or overtly, and I believe I am among the 'we'. It will be accepted by everybody that the primitive men were different from us in the way of thinking, living, and understanding of the outer world, but not different in the way of feeling and understanding and emotions indigenous to the human mind. In the latter respect they cannot have been dead-alive. That's why I started to dig into the basic number notion in the light of anthropo-linguisticc. So, this paper has always been sustained by the belief in universalism and cross-cultural research. In spite of seemingly wonderful progress and development of modern sciences, human mentality and psychology, the core of human mind, have not grown and advanced accordingly. The drive of this conviction was always in my mind to probe what it was that motivated the birth of language, allowing me the pleasure similar to archaological excavation. And now we may justly conclude in brief that 'two-ness' is one of the most prolific semantemes.

Finally let me end with the quotation from Hermann Paul, my ever-respecting scholar. (Prinzipien der Spachgeschichte, P.6)

> Der menschliche Geist muss immer mit dem menschlichen Leibe und der umgebenden Natur zusammenwirken, um irgend ein Kulturprodukt hervorzubringen, und die

Beschaffenheit desselben, die Art, wie es zu stande kommt, hängt eben so wohl von physischen als von psychischen Bedingungen ab; die einen wie die andern zu Kenhtnis notwendig fur ein vollkommenes Verständnis des geschichtlichen Werdens. Es bedarf daher neben der Psychologie auch einer Kenntnis der Gesetze, nach denen sich die physischen Faktoren der Kultur bewegen. Auch die Naturwissenschaften und die Mathematik sind eine notwendige Basis der Kulturwissenschaften, Wenn uns das im allgemeinen nicht zum Bewusstsein Kommt, so liegt das daran, dass wir uns gemeiniglich mit der unwissenschaftlichen Beobachtung des täglichen Lebens begnügen und damit auch bei dem, was man gewöhnlich unter Geschichte versteht, leidlich auskommen.

Abbreviations: AHD The American Heritage Dictionary.
UED The Universal English Dictionary.(Wyld)
Klein Comprehensive Etymological Dictionary.

Appendix No. 1: The etymology of basic number:

ONE: *oi-ons, whence GK. oinos (masc.), oine (fen.), 'the ace (on dice)'. OL. oinos, L. unus, L. unus, 'one' ...

CF. ONCE, ONLY, ANY, ALONE, NONE, ELEVEN, UNIQUE, UNIT, UNIVERSE,....

TWO: *twai-, ,L. bis- (combining from bi-), suffixed from *dwis-no-, zero-grade form *du-.

CF. TWO. TWAIN, TWELVE, TWILIGHT, TWIST, TWICE, BETWEEN; DOUBLE, DUPLE, DOUBT, DUBIOUS, ... (Pokorny duo(u)-228).

FIRST: *per- (forward), suffixed from *pro-ato-, (fore+most), SECOND: *sekw- (to follow), L. secus (alongside of). L. suffixed o-grade form socius (*sokwo-yo). L. signum (object which one follows).

CF. SECT, CONSEQUENT, SUE, INTRINSIC, SIGN, SEAL, DESIGN, SOCIAL, SOCIETY, ASSOCIATE, ...

Appendix No. 2: Max Müller's 121 Original Concepts:

1. Dig
2. Plait, weave, sew, bind.
3. Crush, Pound, destroy, waste, rub, smoothe.
4. Sharpen.
5. Smear, colour, knead, harden.
6. Scratch.
7. Bite, eat.
8. Divide, share, eat.
9. Cut.
10. Gather, observe.
11. Stretch, spread.
12. Mix.
13. Scatter, strew.
14. Sprinkle, drip, wet.
15*a*. Shake, tremble, quiver, flicker.
15*b*. Shake mentally, be angry, abashed, fearful, etc.
16. Throw down, fall.
17. Fall to pieces.
18. Shoot, throw at.

19. Pierce, split.
20. Join, fight, check.
21. Tear.
22. Break, smash.
23. Measure.
24. Blow.
25. Kindle.
26. Milk, yield.
27. Pour, flow, rush.
28. Separate, free, leave, lack.
29. Glean.
30. Choose,
31. Cook, roast, boil.
32. Clean.
33. Wash.
34. Bend, bow.
35. Turn, roll.
36. Press, fix.
37. Squeeze.
38. Drive, thrust.
39. Push, stir, live.
40. Burst, gush, laugh, beam.
41. Dress.
42. Adorn.
43. Strip, remose.
44. Steal.
45. Check.
46. Fill, thrive, swell, grow, strong.
47. Cross.
48. Sweeten.
49. Shorten.
50. Thin, suffer.
51. Fat, stick, love.
52. Lick.
53. Suck, nourish.
54. Drink, Swell.
55. Swallow, sip.
56. Vomit.
57. Chew, eat.
55. Open, extend.
59. Reach, strive, rule, have.
60. Conquer, take by violence, struggle.
61. Perform, succeed.
62. Attack, hurt.
63. Hide, dive.
64. Cover, embrace.
65. Bear, carry.
66. Can, be strong.
67. Show.
68. Touch.
69. Strike.
70. Ask.
71. Watch, observe.
72. Lead.
73. Set.
74. Hold, wield.
75. Give. yield.
76. Couch.
77. Thirst, dry.
78. Hunger.
79. Yawn.
80. Spue.
81. Fly.
82. Sleep.
83. Bristle, dare.
84. Be angry, harsh.
85. Breathe.
86. Speak.
87. See.
88. Hear.
89. Smell, sniff.
90. Sweat.
91. Seethe, boil.
92. Dance.
93. Leap.
94. Creep.
95. Stumble.
96. Stick.
97. Burn.
98. Dwell.
99. Stand.
100. Sink, lie, fail.
101. Swing.
102. Hang down, lean.
103. Rise up, grow
104. Sit.
105. Toil.
106. Weary, waste, slacken
107. Rejoice, please,
108. Desire, love.
109. Wake.
110. Fear.
111. Cool, refresh.
112. Stink.
113. Hate.
114. Know.
115. Think.
116. Shine.
117. Run.
118. Move, go.
119*a*. Noise, inarticulate.
119*b*. Noise, musical.
120. Do,
121, Be.

Preceding the above list, M. Moncalm says (The origin of thought and speech, p.88.1905.):

> The world was astonishcd some few years ago by a declaration made by students of the science of language that the 250,000 words comprehended in the English Dictionary now

being published at Oxford all proceeded from about 800 roots; and it has now been found possible to reduce this number. In any case 500 to 800 Sanscrit roots, on account of their great fertility, sufficed our Aryan ancestors for all the many words occurring in Sanscrit literature and suffice also for us who have 245,000 living animals and 95,000 fossil specimens to name; also 100,000 living and 2500 fossil plants, without speaking of crystals, metals and minerals.

Appendix No. 3: Swadesh's Tentative list of Basic vocabulary: (M. Swadesh, The origin and Diversification of Language, p. 283. 1971)

1. I	26. root	51. breasts	76. rain
2. you	27. bark	52. heart	77. stone
3. We	28. skin	53. liver	78. sand
4. this	29. flesh	54. drink	79. earch
5. that	30. blood	55. cat	80. cloud
6. who	31. bone	56. bite	81. smoke
7. what	32. grease	57. see	82. fire
8. not	33. egg	58. hear	83. ash
9. all	34. horn	59. know	84. burn
10. many	35. tail	60. sleep	85. path
11. one	36. feather	61. die	86. mountain
12. two	37. hair	62. kill	87. red
13. big	38. head	63. swin	88. green
14. long	39. car	64. fly	89. yellow
15. small	40. eye	65. walk	90. white
16. woman	41. nose	66. come	91. black
17. man	42. mouth	67. lie	92. night
18. person	43. tooth	68. sit	93. hot
19. fish	44. tongue	69. stand	94. cold
20. bird	45. claw	70. give	95. full
21. dog	46. foot	71. say	96. new
22. louse	47. knee	72. sun	97. good
23. tree	48. hand	73. moon	98. round
24. seed	49. belly	74. star	99. dry
25. leaf	50. neck	75. water	100. name

Appendix No. 4: Idioms containing the basic numerals 'one' and 'two':

ONE=INDEFINITY:

One day he met with a girl who was a one for music.

It's one of those things.

He was one among a thousand.

He will meet her again one of these fine days.

He is one of us, he can act like one.

He works like a good one.

I am busy one way or another.

I must repay him in the one thing or another.

I must be away only one or two days.

Let's have one, when I come back.

One after another all the plans will be successful.

I for one, can't be sure of it.

=SINGULARITY, UNITY:

He and she will be made one.

If he says one thing, she is sure to say another.

Those who are at odds must be set at one.

We must gather up in one.

We are all one on that point.

At home she is wife, house keeper, mother, all in one.

Wealth or poverty is all one to her.

He and I was born on one and the same day.

I hear he gets wild when he has one over the eight.

I'll ask him why his words and deeds do not agree in one.

I am a one-man at home.

TWO=DUPLICITY:

Let's drop in at a pub or two.

Think twice and after a cup or two you'd better go to bed.

One or two is not enough; two or three will be all right.

=FIGURATIVE MEANING IN COMBINATION WITH OTHER NOUNS:

I put two and two together and see that he is in two minds as to whether he should follow the advice.

The fact is that two or three of us gave him a two-edged criticism.

They are notorious among us for being two-faced.

The context of situation makes possible a great variety connotative notional syllabus involving 'two-ness', so that it is, as a matter of fact, up to each individual as well as linguistic scientists to open and enrich a 'closed system' of each language

family. (Cf. E.T. Hall. The Hidden Dimension, p. 1.) e. g.
/No/ two ways about it !
You've given him a double cross for a nickel.

Appendix No.5 : The words related to numeration :

1) COUNT : OF. conter (F. compter) // L. computare (to sum up, reckon) ; *peue- (to cut, ptrike, stamp) ; related to COMPUTE.
2) CALCULATE : L. calculus (small stone, pebble, stone used in reckoning) ; calx (small stone used in gaming)
3) RECKON : *reg- (straight, right ; to lead, direct) ; L. regere (to keep straight, lead straight, guide, lead, rule)
4) FIGURE : L. figurare (to from, shape) // *dheogh- (to knead clay). L. figura (form, shape =result of kneading)
5) MEASURE : *me- (to measure) ; related to METER.
6) SCORE : *sker- (to cut) ; related to SHEAR : SHARE : SCISSORS : SCAR : SHORT : SHIRT : SCREEN : CARNIVAL : CURT : CURTIL : CORTEX : SCURF : SHARP : SCRAP : PCRAPE : SHRUB : SCREW :
7) FATNOM : *pet- (to spread) // length of two arms stretched out.
8) ADD : *do- (to give) ; L. dare (to give) ; related to DATE : EDITION : RENT : TRADITION : DONATION : PARDON : DOWER : ENDOW : ANECDOTE : DOROTHY : THEODORE :

What is remarkable in the above list is that all of them are suggestive of concrete things and simple actions. (1978)